



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/766,503

01/28/2004

Dan E. Fischer

7678.811

3475

22913

7590

12/04/2008

Workman Nydegger  
1000 Eagle Gate Tower  
60 East South Temple  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER

SINGH, SATYENDRA K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1657

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/04/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/766,503	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FISCHER, DAN E.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SATYENDRA K. SINGH	<b>Art Unit</b> 1657	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Satyendra K. Singh. (3) John M. Guynn (Attorney of record).

(2) Sandy Saucier (Primary Examiner). (4) Dan E. Fischer (Inventor).

Date of Interview: 02 December 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: Applicant presented and demonstrated the wetting properties of the material for "dry covering" used in the Implant device as claimed.

Claim(s) discussed: of the record, esp. claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: of the record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorney of record Mr. John M. Guynn and inventor Mr. Dan Fischer discussed about the superiority of the oxidised cellulose used for the claimed invention for its capability to gelatinize upon contact with water and body fluid, and to retain the bone growth material within the extraction site for repair of tooth cavity. Applicants may amend and/or present arguments to further the prosecution of this case..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Sandra Saucier/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651	
---	--